


COLD WAR

in the
CLASSROOM



by SAMUEL SILLEN

10¢

COLD WAR in the CLASSROOM

by SAMUEL SILLEN

New York
Masses & Mainstream, Inc.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Samuel Sillen is editor of *Masses & Mainstream*. He was a member of the English Department at the University of Wisconsin from 1930 to 1935, and at New York University from 1935 to 1944. He is the editor of *Walt Whitman: Poet of American Democracy* and of *William Cullen Bryant*.

COLD WAR in the CLASSROOM

By SAMUEL SILLEN

THE COLD war spells ruin for the American school system. From kindergarten to college, the educational structure is rocking under the heaviest bombardment in our history. A whole generation of Americans will be the casualties of this attack if it is allowed to continue.

Does this picture seem overdrawn? Consider the following estimates of the school scene by conservative leaders during the last two years:

1. The condition of the nation's educational plant—buildings, equipment, etc.—is “probably the worst in history,” reports Oscar R. Ewing, head of the Federal Security Administration.

A 525-page survey, *American School Buildings*, by the American Association of School Administrators reveals that “large numbers” of pupils are attending unsafe and outdated schools, many of them built “long before the Civil War.”

At least twelve billion dollars are vitally needed for school construction. Instead, those billions and more are being spent for weapons of destruction. The A-bombs and H-bombs are blasting the classroom, and at the present rate we'll soon need DP camps for our school children.

2. “The miasma of thought-control that is now spreading over the country is the greatest menace to the United States since Hitler.” This is the testimony of Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago.

And the leading scholastic body in the country, Phi Beta

Kappa, warns that as a result of the loyalty oath hysteria, "teachers are being intimidated and students are being led to believe that colleges dare no longer engage in the disinterested pursuit of truth, but must become instruments of propaganda."

The cold war mission specifically assigned to the schools by Washington bigwigs and brasshats is the throttling of "dangerous thoughts." With every demagogue and bigot moving in for the big kill, the disasters of education in World War I days as recorded in Upton Sinclair's *The Goose-Step* today seem like a trifling prelude.

3. The "shortage" of teachers has created "the most critical school crisis in our history," reports Dr. Ralph McDonald, executive secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards set up by the National Education Association. So acute is this crisis, adds Dr. Ray C. Maul, research director of the same commission, that "we will continue to employ emergency, sub-standard teachers who lack sufficient education or training to do an adequate job."

The commission revealed last year that of the 20 million children in the elementary grades, 13 million are being taught by teachers with less than a four-year college education. Five million children have teachers who did not complete two years of college.

But what accounts for this so-called shortage? Top causes include: substandard pay for teachers, threat of thought-control persecution, exclusion of teachers on the basis of color, religion, national origin and political creed.

All these factors have been pitched to an unprecedented high by the cold war policy jointly sponsored by the bosses of the Democratic and Republican Parties.

With the high lords of American finance bent on ruling the world, is it any wonder they begin with a death grip on the schools at home? If they are frustrated in their ambition

to tell the Chinese or Polish people what to think, what wonder that they should insist on ordering American minds to march to their tune?

The developing fascist pattern alarms all sober students of recent history. The peril is scarcely overstated by Dr. Kirtley Mather of Harvard when he observes that the line of attack is "ominously reminiscent of the techniques used by Hitler in the first years of his Nazi regime in ill-fated Germany. Even though the onslaught against academic freedom is done in the name of 'Americanism' and beneath the banner of democracy, the consequences are utterly antagonistic to the basic principles of our national life."

The American people are the first victims of the anti-Communist war drive—also "ominously reminiscent" of Hitler's technique. Unless Americans unite to protect our schools, we shall be lending a hand in the permanent damage of our own sons and daughters.

Let us then take a closer look at some of the main facts and issues.

WITCH HUNT

The story of academic freedom in the cold war to date reads like a page out of the Inquisition or the Salem Witch Hunts.

Take the snooping into textbooks. With an impudence equalled only by its own actions in other fields, the House Un-American Committee ordered Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, Smith, Wellesley, and many other colleges to turn over for inspection and approval a list of textbooks and supplementary readings used in social science courses.

Said Dr. Mildred McAfee Horton, retiring president of Wellesley College: "I suppose this list must include the Bible, but it may be unwise to let it be known that you have been allowed to read that injunction to 'love your enemy.'" Dr.

Horton, who was head of the Waves during the war, pointed out that Americans today are surrounded by "Red-baiters and black-haters," and that there was "good reason" these days for people to be afraid to have convictions.

Branch offices of the Un-American Committee, such as the Tenney Committee in California and the Canwell Committee in the State of Washington, have followed through with educational witch-hunts in the various states. Nor has the inquisition been limited to the colleges. The assault on the New York Teachers Union, which the Board of Education seeks to outlaw, is only one episode in a lengthy, blood-chilling serial of repression, and the Feinberg Law in New York, as we shall see later, marks a new low point in American education freedom.

Enough professors were driven off the American campus in the past two years to form a new University-in-Exile. The faculty of scholars purged on political grounds would come from every part of the country and would include authorities in a variety of subjects ranging from archaeology to zoology. Among others the catalogue might list:

Dr. George Parker, professor of Bible and philosophy, fired "for political activities" from Methodist Evansville College in Indiana two days after he presided at a rally addressed by Henry Wallace.

Dr. Clarence R. Athearn, professor of philosophy and social ethics at Lycoming College, removed because of his association with the Progressive Party in Pennsylvania.

Professor James Barfoot, dismissed from the University of Georgia when he accepted the Progressive Party nomination for Governor of Georgia.

Dr. Richard G. Morgan, Curator of the Ohio State Museum, long a leader of the fight in his community against Jim Crow, fired after twelve years of service because of anti-fascist activity.

Professor Lyman R. Bradley, head of the German De-

partment at New York University's Washington Square College, ousted because of his work in behalf of Franco's victims.

Professor Lee Lorch, dropped from C.C.N.Y. and then Penn State for his fight against barring of Negroes as tenants in New York's Stuyvesant Town, owned by Metropolitan Life.

Dr. Ralph Spitzer, dismissed from Oregon State because he had suggested, in the pages of a scientific journal, an objective examination of Lysenko's studies in genetics.

To this list many other names could be added: Hans Freistadt of the University of North Carolina, Don West of Oglethorpe, Luther K. McNair, Dean of Lyndon State Teachers College in Vermont, and others. In addition many students have been dismissed for their progressive views—for example, Irving Feiner, a war veteran, who was "severed" from Syracuse University following his activities on behalf of the Trenton Six. Progressive student organizations have been *verboden* on scores of college and high school campuses.

"FIT TO TEACH"?

The festering issue was brought to a head last year by an action which John Rankin hailed in Congress as at last making "America safe for Americans." What delighted Rankin was the dismissal of three professors from the University of Washington on the ground that, in the words of the university's president Raymond B. Allen, "A Communist is incompetent to teach." In the specific sphere of academic freedom this case has an importance comparable to the trial of the Communist leaders in the broader battle against reaction and fascism.

Just as no overt illegal act was charged in the indictment of the Communist leaders, so there was no grievance registered against the teaching record of the dismissed professors. Nor did the Washington case originate on the campus itself.

It represented an invasion of the campus following a typical anti-Red jamboree by the Canwell Committee.

The three professors—Herbert J. Phillips, Joseph Butterworth and Ralph H. Gundlach—were no mysterious strangers at the University of Washington, suddenly to be smoked out by the police. Phillips had taught at the university since 1920 and held the rank of Associate Professor of Philosophy; Butterworth had been an Associate in English since 1929; Gundlach, an Associate Professor of Psychology, had been with the university since 1924.

Thus, these men, with periods of service ranging from twenty to twenty-nine years, were obviously well known to thousands of students and scores of colleagues. No complaint had ever been registered against them as teachers and scholars. In fact, as the majority report of the faculty committee designated to investigate charges pointed out: "The complainant [that is, the university administration] conceded during the hearing that the general scholarship and teaching ability of respondents Phillips and Butterworth, in their respective fields, were not challenged."

The sole "charge," then, against Phillips and Butterworth was that they are members of the Communist Party. But here there was no issue of fact, since both professors declared (not "admitted") that they are members of the Communist Party; moreover, they said so at the very outset of the hearing. The faculty committee's report to President Allen showed an eight to three vote in favor of retaining Butterworth and Phillips. They found no cause for dismissal under the university's tenure code.

But Dr. Allen, overriding this faculty recommendation, held that teachers should be concerned with "the pursuit of truth wherever it may lead" and that, being Communists, Phillips and Butterworth are necessarily "incompetent, intellectually dishonest and derelict in their duty to find and teach the truth."

Dr. Allen is himself, of course, a shining model of intellectual honesty. He wants the pursuit of truth "wherever it may lead"—provided it does not lead to communism. He will defend to the death your right to believe—if you believe in capitalism. He pronounces the professors "incompetent"—having dutifully read the report of his own faculty committee that they are highly competent.

Moreover, he accuses Communist teachers of "smuggling" ideas into the classroom—when the faculty report states:

"It is impossible to conceive how the mere fact of membership in the Communist Party could, in any way, affect the competency of respondent Butterworth as a teacher of Old English literature. As to respondent Phillips, there is potentially a closer question. As a teacher of philosophy, it might be suggested that, without specific proof, his objectivity as a teacher would necessarily be impaired by his strong bias in favor of a doctrinaire political philosophy. However, the testimony of his colleagues and students is directly to the contrary. Although he does have occasion to discuss Marxian philosophy in his teachings, it appears that his practice is to warn his students of his bias and to request that they evaluate his lectures in the light of that fact."

Where, we may ask, is the reactionary teacher, including Dr. Allen, who will similarly make clear his own point of view so that the student may judge for himself?

Ironically, then, the University of Washington case, which was supposed to raise the so-called "thorny question" of whether a Communist is fit to teach, itself answers the question in terms of the concrete teaching records of men like Phillips and Butterworth.

Instead of puzzling over how it comes about that these admittedly excellent teachers and scholars can also be good Communists, educators, parents and students would do well to study the relation between these two facts. Communist discipline, which is painted as crushing independence, is in

fact a democratic discipline which trains the teacher to look on his students not as empty jugs, in the manner of the conventional academic snob, but as partners in intellectual inquiry. The scientific spirit of Marxism cuts through the superstitions and prejudices that bottle up effective research. And Communist ideas are opposed to the police mentality of a Dr. Allen and others who are trying to turn our schools into armed camps with daily sergeant's inspection.

But of course the whole claim that Communists are not "fit to teach" is hypocritical hogwash. Actually, the anti-Communist drive serves as a smokescreen for the attack on all teachers who have the presumption to do their thinking for themselves. While Communist teachers are being fired, it is clear that the vast majority of teachers penalized for their beliefs are non-Communists.

The clearest example of this technique is the Feinberg Law in New York State, a law which will serve as an example of similar legislation in other areas. Signed by Governor Dewey, the law directs the State Board of Regents to weed out "subversives" from all levels of the public school system. The Board makes its own list of "subversive" organizations or groups. It may "utilize similar listings or designations promulgated by any Federal agency or authority"—which makes J. Edgar Hoover the ultimate employer of teachers in New York State.

Not only that, but membership in any group so listed "shall constitute prima facie evidence . . . of disqualification for appointment to, or retention in, any office or position in the public schools of the state."

This law was challenged in the courts in two separate actions, one by the Communist Party of New York State, and the other by a group of New York teachers. And in both cases, heard separately by Judges Harry E. Schirick and Murray Hearn of the New York Supreme Court, the Feinberg Law was ruled unconstitutional. The judges declared that the

law reversed traditional patterns of freedom by setting up the doctrine of guilt by association, by assigning arbitrary powers to the executive branch of government, by depriving the individual of due process.

The Feinberg Law is a flagrant example of the effort to prostitute the schools. It proves the contention of Professor John J. De Boer of Illinois that "The drive against free teaching today is being coordinated very carefully with the drive toward war." It illustrates the truth expressed by Rose V. Russell, legislative representative of the New York Teachers Union, that reactionaries aim to cover up the wretched conditions in our schools by intimidating teachers.

Nor is the fight against this measure over. By no means. Its powerful backers are seeking a new sanction for it in the higher courts.

THE TERMITES THRIVE

In the meantime, it should be noted, truly subversive teachers are going scot free and in fact getting the blessings of the school boards. Thus May Quinn, who actively preached hatred against Jews and Negroes in her classrooms, is justified by the New York Board of Education. A dissenting member of the Board, James Marshall, wrote concerning this darling of the Christian Fronters: "It is incredible that any person so hard, so callous, so un-understanding as Miss Quinn should have entered or should be retained in the position of teacher."

Similarly, a notorious anti-Semite, Professor William E. Knickerbocker of the City College of New York, wins immunity while the anti-Communist witch hunt blazes on.

In the present atmosphere native fascists, Nazis, Christian Fronters are making a comeback in the schools. The termites thrive in the cold war.

The suppression of books is a clear case in point. In the past couple of years books like Laura Z. Hobson's *Gentle-*

man's Agreement, Arthur Miller's *Focus*, Howard Fast's *Citizen Tom Paine*, and Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* have been excluded from the reading lists in New York. The same pattern is unfolding throughout the country.

At the same time, textbooks filled with racist and chauvinist poison are freely circulating in the schools. The evidence is scandalous.

Recently, the American Council on Education completed a study of 400 school books used throughout the country. It showed that the books contribute substantially to prejudice against foreign-language speaking people with accents, that they tend to preach the myth of Anglo-Saxon superiority, and that they perpetuate anti-Negro and anti-Semitic lies.

Especially disgusting is the fact that school children are taught in most textbooks to adopt Ku Klux Klan ideas about the Negro people. The study shows that:

"A very large proportion of the references to Negroes put before pupils treats Negroes as slaves or as child-like freedmen; very little data about Negroes since 1876 are to be found in the history texts. The plantation mammy and Uncle Remus stereotypes tend to be perpetuated both in social science and literary materials. Textbooks in all fields, on occasion even in biology, present hazy and confused ideas about race, scientific data about race being conspicuous by their absence. The illustrative materials of the texts deal even less adequately and sensitively with Negroes than do the printed words."

In a good many of the school texts, the Negroes are portrayed as having been "happy and contented" during slavery, with no indication whatsoever of their militant and heroic struggles for freedom.

Similarly with the Jew, who is exposed to the taunts and hostility of some classmates whose prejudices, picked up in bigoted homes, are intensified by what they read in the offi-

cially sanctioned books. And the same is true of all other minority national groups.

The teaching of Anglo-Saxon supremacy and white superiority is on the rise—another component of the cold war program.

Further evidence is provided in reports issued early in 1950 by the Teachers Union and the United Parents Association of New York. The U.P.A. report criticized the Board of Education for using textbooks which contain no favorable references to any group other than the Anglo-Saxon.

The committee pointed out: "Although it is most important that books with objectionable passages not be used in the schools, it is not enough that a book avoid irreverent, offensive and derogatory statements about various groups. The book must build, it must create in a child who reads it a feeling of the worth and dignity of human beings, of the worth and dignity of himself and his family."

This healthy insistence is in conflict with the policy of those who are preparing the country for war. That policy calls for the whipping up of chauvinist feelings. The fight for democratic textbooks cannot be separated from the fight for peace.

CORPORATION DIRECTORY

While school boards and college administrations pretend to be the guardians of spiritual advance, they are in fact very much bound to selfish interests. College boards, for example, have increasingly become instruments of Big Business, and in fact big businesses themselves in many instances.

By 1900, as the Beards noted in *The Rise of American Civilization*, "the roster of American trustees of higher learning read like a corporation directory." Let us turn then to cold cash. We may begin by recalling an investigation of the Federal Trade Commission in 1928. This revealed that the power trust was subsidizing propaganda for private own-

ership in the schools; and the "close connection between public utilities and the academic profession" was confirmed by the American Association of University Professors following an investigation in 1930. Thousands of dollars, it was found, were spent by the utilities in fees to professors and promotion of textbooks favorable to the power trust. What happened then? Were these professors fired? "It is significant," says an American Civil Liberties Union report in 1940, "that after this exposure of the prostitution of the schools and colleges to the Power Trust no teacher was dismissed or disciplined. Some of them may have severed their connection by reason of policy or because of pressure by the authorities of the institution under criticism, but nothing happened remotely akin to the prompt dismissal of teachers or professors guilty of 'radical' utterances."

Is this an old story? Have we changed all that? Consider the record of Bloomfield College in New Jersey, an institution that bars "Reds, pinks and near-pinks" from its teaching staff. Why? Because of academic freedom. "They don't have to come here if they don't want to," President Frederick Schweitzer told the newspapers. "That's my definition of academic freedom. They're free not to come here." Five years ago Bloomfield was on the rocks financially. But "our new policies have attracted the interest of rich, conservative Americans, and so we're doing all right now," says Dr. Schweitzer.

And how have the rich been attracted to the higher learning? Bloomfield trains "responsible" labor leaders to drive out "the irresponsible pink ones." As an example, Bloomfield's president boasts of how his graduates rooted out "subversive" elements from the United Electrical Workers in Newark with the aid of a group called Counterattack. And Counterattack, the educator explains, "is composed of ex-F.B.I. men who are rooting out subversive elements in labor unions and we got them in contact with the good, Chris-

tian people in the union." To complete this picture of academic virtue, the creed of Bloomfield College should be quoted: "We want to develop a new kind of political leader here and left wingers always want to be objective. We want Americanism taught here, not objectivity."

Is this a "crank" example, a sort of lunatic fringe of the American academy? At its convention last year the Association of American Colleges, most influential body in this field, had some 400 college presidents on hand. A few final words were spoken by the association's retiring president, Kenneth I. Brown, head of Denison University in Ohio. Brown, as reported by *Time* magazine, said that the college president of today is little more than a salesman who "scurries around the country seeking the company of rich widows. . . . One gathers the irrefutable impression that the item of major concern is not the maturing of the individual but buildings, large, spacious, attractive buildings. . . . The ethics of the counting house too often replace the higher standards common once in education."

That the college president divides his time between hunting after rich widows and hunting down radical professors will surprise nobody who has studied such works as Thorstein Veblen's *The Higher Learning in America*, *A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men* or John E. Kirkpatrick's *The American College and Its Rulers*. As Veblen noted, the men of "pecuniary substance" have taken over the direction of academic affairs. With their concern for tangible properties there goes "a visible reluctance on the part of these businesslike boards to expend the corporation's income for those intangible, immaterial uses for which the university is established."

Veblen wrote this thirty years ago when university dollars were still mainly in the small business stage. Today New York University owns the C. F. Mueller Company, spaghetti manufacturer; the Ramsey Corporation, which makes and sells

piston rings; American Limoges China, Inc.; the Howes Leather Company valued at \$35,000,000; and other holdings.

Columbia University, in its last report, lists its investment in Rockefeller Center at \$28,230,311 (with rent receipts of nearly four million dollars last year), and other property at \$16,371,685. Union College of Schenectady, New York, has bought (for \$16,250,000) the real estate of Allied Stores Corporation, which operates the country's largest department store chain, and (for \$9,000,000) the real estate, store buildings and warehouse of Abraham & Straus in Brooklyn. Oberlin College, Ohio, has bought such properties as the Montgomery Ward stores, a number of Woolworth buildings and Sears Roebuck locations. Morningside College of Sioux City, Iowa, owns the street car company of that city. Other colleges own cattle ranches, walnut groves and filling stations.

These enterprises are exempt from taxation since their profits presumably are turned to "educational purposes." As a New York Times survey reported, the tax savings to one university last year amounted to \$3,000,000. Increasingly colleges are resorting to the practice of buying properties and then "leasing" them back to the original owner, with no tax paid by either. Thus, N.Y.U.'s spaghetti factory alone saved over \$300,000 in taxes in 1948. Behind the ivied walls university administrators appear to be conducting some of the shrewdest operations in Big Business history.

MEN WHO RULE

Who are these academic rulers that install Eisenhower at Columbia, Stassen at Pennsylvania, Allen at the University of Washington? The answer is indicated in Hubert Park Beck's *Men Who Control Our Universities* (King's Crown Press, 1947). This book is a statistical analysis of the economic and social composition of the governing boards or trustees

of the thirty leading American universities, private and state. It deals with 734 trustees.

Of the 734 there is not a single worker, not a single Negro, while only 1 per cent are farmers and 3.4 per cent are women. Nor do educators fare very much better. The total number of educators of any type was 36 (and this included 12 university presidents who were members ex-officio). By far the largest number of trustees are men who hold directorships and executive offices in large-scale industry and finance. Of the 734, 41 per cent appear in some social register. The average income of those with known taxable income as of 1924 was \$102,000, with the median income well over \$50,000.

Membership on the university governing board is not an "honorary" post, nominal in function. The trustees appoint the president, hire and fire, buy and sell. And they represent not merely business in general but Big Business, with names like Sewell L. Avery, Lammot du Pont, Alfred P. Sloan, Thomas J. Watson, George Whitney, *et al.* The author of this study points out:

"Almost half (194) of the 400 largest business organizations of the country had among their officers or directors persons who were at the time of the study also members of the governing boards of these 30 leading universities. Even among these 400, those corporations having the largest assets provided the larger proportion of trustees holding such positions. . . . Not only did these 175 trustees hold 386 offices or directorships in enterprises numbered among the 400 largest business organizations in the country, but they held in addition 935 similar positions in enterprises not among the 400 largest, making a total of 1,321 positions, or an average of 7.5 per trustee for this key group of 175."

Directorships in public utilities were held by 50 per cent of the California Institute of Technology board, by 47 per cent of the Johns Hopkins board. Six trustees at Princeton and seven at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology had

direct connections with a Morgan partner. The insurance companies and railroads account for a heavy proportion of college governors.

Are these rulers of the universities passionately devoted to the pursuit of truth "wherever it may lead"? Do they have "independent" opinions? The trustees in answer to a poll in 1936 as to the candidate they would vote for gave 26 per cent for Roosevelt, 63 per cent for Landon. The American people gave Roosevelt 523 electoral votes to Landon's eight. In answer to another question—Should unemployed persons who are willing to work be given jobs at prevailing wages by the government?—33 per cent answered yes, 59 per cent answered no. As far back as fifteen years ago a majority were in favor of compulsory military training for students.

Men like these are presuming to defend "free inquiry" by firing progressives. Men like these are declaring that Communists are not "competent" to teach because they are subject to "outside coercion." Surely the smell of this hypocrisy reaches unto heaven. Will any but academic sheep be deluded by this pious cant?

The hard figures of academic control by Big Business are paralleled by the defense evidence produced in the trial of the Communist leaders. In the Southern District Federal Court of New York, where the trial took place, there have been 28 grand jury panels since 1940, with 7,487 names. Executives, making up 9 per cent of the district's population, have formed 45 per cent of the panels; manual workers, with 55 per cent of the population, have formed 5 per cent of the panels. Or take another set of figures. Of 1,155 Manhattan jurors on panels for November and December, 1948, and for January, 1949, 649 or 56 per cent were drawn from the silk-hat 17th Congressional District, the greatest concentration of wealthy families in America. By contrast, less than 2 per cent of the panels were drawn from the working-class neighborhoods, Negroes, Jews, Puerto Ricans.

"INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY"

The facts of class control are totally ignored in the most recent theoretical contribution to education for cold war, James Bryant Conant's *Education in a Divided World*. The Harvard president, like Judge Medina, regards class concepts as un-American despite the obvious fact that class realities are American realities. "As we are all [all?] coming to realize, in reviewing the past forty years, the impact of the European radical doctrines of the nineteenth century based on the notion of the class struggle confused the thinking of some of our reformers of the early days of this century," Conant writes. "These foreign doctrines have to a considerable degree diverted the attention of forward-looking men and women from the social goals implicit in our native American tradition." Note that President Conant speaks of "foreign doctrines" as if ideas can be tested by their point of origin and as if the American tradition of Jefferson sprang immaculate from our soil without benefit of "foreign doctrines." Observe too that radical ideas have turned us from our tradition, not the giant monopolies that are trying to stamp out that tradition. But I am more concerned here with Conant's thesis dealing with education "as an instrument of national policy."

For in developing this thesis Conant prepares a theory that perhaps more effectively than any other will justify the academic repressions which he claims to fear. We must prepare, says Conant, for an indefinitely prolonged "armed truce" between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. For "some years to come," American policy will be based on this armed truce. The job of education as an instrument of national policy is to help wage this cold war. The colleges must therefore support the military draft of students, even though this is admittedly not desirable from an educational point of view. Equally important, the colleges must help wage the battle of ideas, such as the concept of equality of opportunity as "an

exportable commodity." And this in turn means that the colleges must help root out the alien class concepts of the "quick-witted fanatics" who "take their orders from Moscow."

Curiously enough, Conant supplies evidence which blasts sky high, in terms of the specific field of education, his bland assurance that we have such an abundance of equal opportunity that it has become "an exportable commodity." He cites the scientific study by Lloyd W. Warner and Robert J. Havighurst entitled *Who Shall Be Educated?* This gives a picture of social stratification in a midwestern city before the war. Conant summarizes:

"The percentage of superior high school graduates who attended college followed the parental income scale in a startling manner, starting with a 100 per cent college attendance for those whose family income was over \$8,000 a year, dropping to 44 per cent for the range from \$3,000 to \$2,000, and falling to 20 per cent for those with incomes under \$500. These were all superior students, let us bear in mind; all, therefore, good college material."

Thus, not only the rulers of universities but the students reflect the class exclusions of American capitalism. But, answers Conant, we at least cherish the *concept* of equal opportunity. And, indeed this concept, like that of academic freedom, is to be cherished. But do the Communists demand *less* equal opportunity? Are Wall Street and Washington trying to outlaw the Communist Party because it opposes their efforts to elevate living standards, to overthrow class barriers to education, to abolish Jim Crow? The world, as Alice found, grows curiouiser and curiouiser.

BRASS HATS

As an example of how American imperialism is exporting spiritual commodities, Conant might refer in his next book to the New York *Times* of February 5, 1949. A dispatch from

Tokyo informs us that Japanese thought-control is being restored by General MacArthur's officers against the will of the Japanese. Communist professors are being fired from the universities under a decree by Captain Paul T. Dupell, civil education officer for the Tokyo Military Government team. It appears, says the dispatch, that "the Occupation's thinking on Communists has veered around to the view the Japanese held twenty-two years earlier." And how do MacArthur's men justify the adoption of the original Japanese thought-control code? Why very simply and obviously they point out that the same thing is being done back home! The export trade in academic freedom flourishes indeed.

Military control of education in Japan has its parallel at home. We can trace the pattern from the appointment of General Eisenhower at Columbia to the designation of Army Secretary Gordon Gray as president of the University of North Carolina. With militarization on the order of the day, the scientific laboratories are being converted into barracks.

In February, 1950, a group of leading educators and other public figures issued an 80-page booklet *Militarism in Education*, describing "the systematic and well-financed efforts of the National Military Establishment to penetrate and influence the civilian educational life of America." The report was issued through the National Council Against Conscription. Signers included Albert Einstein; Bishop Gerald Kennedy of the Oregon area of the Methodist Church; James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; William P. Tolley, chancellor of Syracuse University; the Very Rev. John A. Flynn, president of St. John's University in Brooklyn, and twenty others.

The report cited "the desperate need for world peace" and pointed out that education can provide leadership for peace only through "the spirit of free inquiry unhampered by narrow military considerations." In a number of colleges, the report showed, Army contracts for "military science research" have

placed the schools in a position of dependence on military funds for their existence. "Whenever military secrecy becomes important to a college," it added, "the political opinion of students and professors, and their associations, become important and may be the basis for their investigation and dismissal."

The educators noted: "Warmaking is taught in more than a hundred colleges, each of which has its department of military science and tactics, while only two or three colleges in the country have specific courses in or departments of peace."

The fact is that military instruction is beginning to dominate the curriculum. The report compares military training with other parts of the college course of studies, and it reaches these conclusions:

Reserve Officers Training courses (R.O.T.C.) have a more prominent place than most of the social sciences or religion.

Military training is in some schools the one subject taken by every student, affording the military staff the widest opportunity for influence in the school.

Many technical and pre-professional schools offer little sociology or economics, leaving many technicians, farmers, and pre-professional people "indoctrinated with militarism" and with no counterbalancing social studies.

The scientists are a primary target of the offensive. The military now control more than 70 per cent of all scientific research in the U.S.A. As the conservative American Association for the Advancement of Science reported: "There is at present a tendency in public thinking to relate scientific activity almost wholly to military activity exposing scientists more than most occupational groups to sustained and stringent limitations upon their personal freedom." Under brasshat control, science is being shackled by the products of its own research.

The armed forces have worked out a project called—believe it or not—"Operation Professors," aimed at "educating educators." The *Army and Navy Journal* for October 1, 1949 re-

vealed that presidents, deans and professors from sixteen colleges were flown to an Air Force base at Hamilton, California, and "briefed by Maj. Gen. John E. Upston." The program, said the *Journal*, will probably be pursued by military bases across the country.

Education is supposed to serve all the people. In the cold war it is becoming a tool of the brasshats.

SAVE OUR SCHOOLS!

The facts point to an inescapable conclusion. In no area of American life has the cold war had so speedy and severe an impact as in the schools. President Truman's decision to manufacture the hydrogen bomb has intensified that atmosphere of hysteria which poisons the American classroom. Huge appropriations for war, amounting to three-quarters of the national budget, mean a worsening of what Commissioner of Education Earl McGrath calls the "shocking disorder and ineffectiveness" of the educational system today.

While 80% of the huge federal budget goes for war purposes, not a cent has been appropriated by the 81st Congress for federal aid to education. And this despite the fact that the need for such aid was never more imperative. The National Education Association estimates that about 20 million of the voting population (equalling the combined population of 29 states) have less than a sixth-grade education. Two million children between the ages of six and fifteen do not attend any school at all. At the time of the last census, ten million adults were still classed as "functionally illiterate." Over three-fourths of state school boards had less purchasing power in 1947 than in 1940.

The 81st Congress increased J. Edgar Hoover's salary and added many millions to his F.B.I. budget, but refused a penny of aid for the schools. Even the woefully inadequate Administration proposal became a political football, with Cardinal Spellman fighting against limiting aid to public schools.

Failure to enact anti-discrimination laws spells a further attack on Negroes in education. Rule by the F.B.I. means a heightened reign of terror against independent thinking. The anti-Communist drive signals every bigot to join the Nazi-style book burning.

The fight to save the schools, therefore, cannot be separated from the fight against the disastrous bi-partisan war policy and the accompanying reign of terror against progressive ideas.

Specifically, the fight to save the schools means:

1. A demand for federal appropriations for schools and not hell-bombs.
2. A campaign for the repeal of the Feinberg Law in New York and similar thought-control legislation in other states.
3. Defense of teachers under attack for their political beliefs and affiliations, their nationality, religion or color.
4. A fight to remove all discrimination against Negro students and teachers.
5. A protest against the efforts to destroy people's schools like the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York.
6. Support of teachers' groups such as the Teachers Union in their struggle for adequate salaries and teaching standards.
7. Efforts to democratize school boards so that they will truly represent the whole community and not merely a privileged layer.

Such a program can be carried through only if progressive-minded people take an active interest in the educational affairs of their community. Participation in the Parent-Teacher Associations, for example, is imperative for saving the schools.

All Americans of good will are directly and immediately concerned in this fight. The minds of our children, indeed their very lives, are at stake.

MORE ON THE COLD WAR

THE PLOT TO GAG AMERICA by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	\$.03
F.E.P.C.: HOW IT WAS BETRAYED—HOW IT CAN BE SAVED by Rob F. Hall	.03
THE COMMUNIST TRIAL by George Marion	.50
THE C.I.O. TODAY by George Morris	.10
THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE COLD WAR edited by J. S. Allen and D. A. Wilkerson	1.00
MUST WE PERISH? by Hershel D. Meyer	1.00
VERDICT AGAINST FREEDOM by Joseph North	.03
THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE SOVIET UNION by Paul Robeson	.02
WHO PAYS FOR THE COLD WAR? by George Blake	.05
WHY DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF COMMUNISTS? by Herbert Aptheker	.02
AFRICA FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM by Alphaeus Hunton	.05
INTELLECTUALS IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE by Howard Fast	.10
THE COAL MINERS AND YOU by Elmer Felhaber	.03



New Century Publishers

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.